



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,069	08/18/2003	Alain Chateau	TI-33657	4187
23494 7590 10/17/2007 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			EXAMINER PATEL, NIRAV B	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Aug. 2, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 are amended and Claims 11-16 are newly added claims by the applicant.

2. The Office would like to notify the Applicant that there has been a change in Examiner to conduct the future examination and prosecution processes of the currently pending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 5, 9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kean (US Patent No. 7,203,842).

As per claim 1, Kean discloses:

a random number generator for generating a random number implemented in an integrated circuit [Fig. 5, component 72]; an eFuse memory internal to the integrated

Art Unit: 2135

circuit for receiving and permanently storing the random number, said eFuse memory being accessible only internally to the integrated circuit [Fig. 5, component 62 col. 9 lines 18-24, col. 15 lines 24-67, col. 16 lines 1-12].

As per claim 5, Kean discloses:

processing circuitry implemented in an integrated circuit [Fig. 5]; a random root key generator circuit implemented in said integrated circuit and coupled to said processing circuitry [Fig. 5, col. 12 lines 18-20], comprising: a random number generator for generating a random number for the root key [Fig. 5, component 72]; a memory internal to the integrated circuit for receiving and permanently storing the random number, said memory being accessible only internally to the integrated circuit [Fig. 5, component 62 col. 9 lines 18-24, col. 15 lines 24-67, col. 16 lines 1-12].

As per claim 9, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Kean teaches:

storing in an eFuse memory [Fig. 5, component 62 col. 9 lines 18-24, col. 15 lines 24-67, col. 16 lines 1-12].

As per claim 12, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 11. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kean (US Patent No. 7,203,842) and in view of Saito (US Patent No. 6,857,003).

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Kean teaches the random number generator [col. 16 lines 42-57].

Saito teaches:

circuitry for detecting undesirable random number [Fig. 3, col. 4 lines 1-42].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Saito with Kean, since one would have been

Art Unit: 2135

motivated to generate uniform or pure random number which do not substantially have a periodicity [Saito, col. 1 lines 9-10].

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Saito teaches:

said detecting circuitry comprises circuitry for detecting a ratio of "1"s and "0"s in said random number and comparing the ratio to a threshold [col. 4 lines 14-24].

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Saito teaches:

comparing circuitry for comparing a threshold value to the random number, wherein the random number is operable to be regenerated if the threshold value is not passed [Fig. 3, col. 4 lines 14-42].

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Saito teaches: identifying undesirable random numbers and regenerating a new random number in response thereto [Fig. 3, col. 4 lines 1-42].

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and added new claims 11-16, which necessitated new ground of rejection. See rejection above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tamai et al (US 7031946) -- Information recording medium, noncontact IC tag, access device, access system, life cycle management system, input/output method, and access method

Vanstone et al (US 6195433) -- Private key validity and validation

Tiedemann, Jr et al (US 6615050) -- Apparatus and method for reducing message collision between mobile stations simultaneously accessing a base station in a CDMA cellular communication system

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2135

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

*NBP**10/5/07*

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100